arXiv:1611.04163v1 [math.RA] 13 Nov 2016

A note on lower nil M-Armendariz ring

Sushma Singh and Om Prakash
Department of Mathematics
Indian Institute of Technology Patna, Bihta
Patna, INDIA- 801 106
sushmasingh@iitp.ac.in & om@iitp.ac.in

Abstract

In 2005, Liu [5] have done some work on Armendariz ring by using the concept of monoid (u.p. monoid and strictly totally ordered monoid). During study of his work, we prove some results for lower nil M-Armendariz ring. Let M be a strictly totally ordered monoid and I be a proper ideal of R with $N_*(R) \subseteq I$. If R/I is M-Armendariz and I is 2-primal ring, then R is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. Moreover, we observe that if M and N are u.p.-monoids and R is semicommutative as well as M-Armendariz ring, then $R[N]$ is lower nil M-Armendariz ring.

Mathematics Subject Classification: 16S36; 16N60; 16Y99.
Keywords: Armendariz ring, Semicommutative Ring, u.p.-Monoid, M-Armendariz ring, lower nil M-Armendariz ring.

1. Introduction

Throughout this article, R denotes an associative ring with identity unless otherwise stated. For a ring R, $N_*(R)$, $N^*(R)$ and $N(R)$ denote the prime radical (lower nilradical), upper nilradical and the set of nilpotent elements of R respectively. It is known that $N_*(R) \subseteq N^*(R) \subseteq N(R)$. Here, $R[x]$ denotes the polynomial ring in an indeterminate x over ring R and $C_{f(x)}$ for the set of all coefficients of $f(x)$, where $f(x) \in R[x]$. $M_n(R)$ and $T_n(R)$ represent the full ring of matrices of order n and the ring of all upper triangular matrices of order n respectively.
A ring R is said to be Armendariz ring if whenever two polynomials, $f(x)g(x) = 0$ implies $ab = 0$ for each $a \in C_{f(x)}$, $b \in C_{g(x)}$. A ring R is reduced if it has no nonzero nilpotent element. In 1974, Armendariz himself proved that every reduced ring is satisfying above condition [2]. Later, the term Armendariz ring coined by Rege and Chhawchharia [10] in 1997. A ring R is semicommutative ring if whenever $ab = 0$ imples $aRb = 0$ for $a, b \in R$ [9]. As in [3], a ring R (without identity) is said to be 2-primal if $N_*(R) = N(R)$.
Let M be a monoid and e, the identity element of M. For a ring R, $R[M]$ denotes the monoid ring of M over R. Liu [5], defined a ring R is M-Armendariz ring if whenever elements $\alpha = a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n$, $\beta = b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m \in R[M]$ satisfy $\alpha\beta = 0$, then $a_ib_j = 0$ for each i and j. In particular, if $M = \{e\}$, then every ring is M-Armendariz

ring. Moreover, if S is a semigroup with multiplication $st = 0$ for all $s, t \in S$ and $M = S^1$, the semigroup S with identity, then any ring is not an M-Armendariz. Let $M = N \cup \{0\}$. Then R is M-Armendariz if and only if R is Armendariz ring. In 2016, Alhevaz and Hashemi [1] introduced the concept of upper and lower nil-M Armendariz ring relative to monoid. They called, a ring R is upper (respectively, lower) nil M-Armendariz ring if whenever elements $\alpha = a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n$, $\beta = b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m \in R[M]$ such that $\alpha\beta \in N^*(R)[M]$ (*respectively* $N_*(R)[M]$), then $a_ib_j \in N^*(R)$ (*respectively* $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$) for each i and j.

2. Main Results on Lower nil M-Armendariz Ring

Recall that a monoid is called u.p. monoid (unique product monoid) if for any two nonempty finite subsets $A, B \subseteq M$, there exist an element $g \in M$ uniquely presented in the form of ab where $a \in A$ and $b \in B$. The class of unique product monoid is quite large and important. The ring theoretical property of unique product monoid ring has been established by many authors [see [4, 5, 7, 8]] in past few decades.

Theorem 2.1. *For any unique product monoid, every semicommutative ring is lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Let M be a unique product monoid. Let $\alpha = a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n$, $\beta = b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m \in R[M]$ such that $\alpha\beta \in N_*(R)[M]$. This implies $\overline{\alpha}\overline{\beta} = \overline{0}$ in $R/N_*(R)[M]$. We know that $R/N_*(R)$ is reduced, therefore by Proposition (1.1) of [5], $R/N_*(R)$ is M-Armendariz ring. So, $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$ for each i and j. Thus, R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring. □

Theorem 2.2. *Let M be a strictly totally ordered monoid and I be a proper ideal of R with $N_*(R) \subseteq I$. If R/I is M-Armendariz and I is 2-primal ring, then R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Suppose that $\overline{R} = R/I$ is M-Armendariz ring and I is 2-primal ring. Since, $N_*(R) \subseteq I$, so $N_*(R) \subseteq N_*(I)$. Also I is an ideal of R, so $N_*(I) \subseteq N_*(R)$ and hence $N_*(I) = N_*(R)$. Since I is a 2-primal, $I/N_*(R) = I/N_*(I) \cong I/N(I)$, therefore, it is reduced.
Let $\alpha = a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n$ and $\beta = b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m$ such that $\alpha\beta \in N_*(R)[M]$ with $g_1 < g_2 < \ldots < g_m, h_1 < h_2 < \ldots < h_n$ where $g_1, g_2, \ldots, g_n, h_1, h_2, \ldots h_m \in M$. Now, we use transfinite induction on strictly totally ordered set $(M, \leq)$ to show $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$. Since $N_*(R) \subseteq I$, therefore $\alpha\beta \in I[M]$. Since R/I is M-Armendariz, therefore $a_ib_j \in I$ for each i and j. If there exist $1 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$ such that $g_ih_i = g_1h_1$, then $g_1 \leq g_i$ and $h_1 \leq h_j$. If $g_1 < g_i$, then $g_1h_1 < g_ih_1 \leq g_ih_i = g_1h_1$ implies $g_1h_1 < g_1h_1$, a contradiction. Hence $a_1b_1 \in N_*(R)$.
Now, let $w \in M$ be such that for any g_i and h_j, $g_ih_j < w$, $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$. We will show that $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$ for any g_i and h_j with $g_ih_j = w$. Consider $X = \{(g_i, h_j) : g_ih_j = w\}$, then X is a finite set. So, we put $X = \{(g_{i_t}, h_{j_t}) : t = 1, 2, \ldots k\}$ such that $g_{i_1} < g_{i_2} < \ldots < g_{i_k}$. Here M is cancellative, $g_{i_1} = g_{i_2}$ and $g_{i_1}h_{j_1} = g_{i_2}h_{j_2} = w$ imply $h_{j_1} = h_{j_2}$. Since $(M, \leq)$ strictly totally ordered monoid, $g_{i_1} < g_{i_2}$ and $g_{i_1}h_{j_1} = g_{i_2}h_{j_2} = w$, therefore $h_{j_2} < h_{j_1}$. Thus, we have $h_{j_k} < \ldots < h_{j_2} < h_{j_1}$. Now

$$\sum_{g_ih_j = w} a_ib_j = \sum_{t=1}^{t=k} a_{i_t}b_{j_t} \in N_*(R). \tag{2.1}$$

For any $t \geq 2$, $g_{i_1}h_{j_t} < g_{i_t}h_{j_t} = w$ and by induction hypothesis $a_{i_1}b_{j_t} \in N_*(R)$. Take $p = b_{j_t}(a_{i_1}b_{j_1})a_{i_1}$, then $p \in I$, since $a_ib_j \in I$ for each i and j. Since $a_{i_1}b_{j_t} \in N_*(R)$, so $p^2 = b_{j_t}(a_{i_1}b_{j_1})a_{i_1}b_{j_t}(a_{i_1}b_{j_1})a_{i_1} \in N_*(R)$. Since $I/N_*(R)$ is reduced, therefore, $p \in N_*(R)$. Now,

$$(a_{i_t}b_{j_t})(a_{i_1}b_{i_1})^2 = (a_{i_t}(b_{j_t}(a_{i_1}b_{i_1})a_{i_1})b_{i_1}) \in N_*(R) \tag{2.2}$$

Multiplying (2.1) by $(a_{i_1}b_{i_1})^2$ from right, we get
$(a_{i_1}b_{i_1})^3 + \sum_{t=2}^{k}(a_{i_t}b_{i_t})(a_{i_1})b_{i_1})^2 \in N_*(R)$. This implies $(a_{i_1}b_{i_1})^3 \in N_*(R)$. Since $I/N_*(R)$ is reduced, therefore, $(a_{i_1}b_{i_1}) \in N_*(R)$.
Again by (2.1) we have

$$a_{i_2}b_{i_2} + \ldots + a_{i_k}b_{i_k} \in N_*(R) \tag{2.3}$$

so, $(a_{i_t}b_{i_t})(a_{i_2}b_{i_2})^2 = (a_{i_t}b_{i_t})(a_{i_2}b_{i_2})(a_{i_2}b_{i_2}) \in N_*(R)$. Multiplying (2.3) by $(a_{i_2}b_{i_2})^2$ from right side, we get $(a_{i_2}b_{i_2})^3 \in N_*(R)$. This implies $(a_{i_2}b_{i_2}) \in N_*(R)$, because $I/N_*(R)$ is reduced. Continuing the procedure, we get $a_{i_t}b_{j_t} \in N_*(R)$ for $t = 1, 2, \ldots k$ with $g_ih_j = w$. Therefore, by transfinite induction, $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$, for each i and j. Thus R is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. □

Proposition 2.1. *Let M be a monoid with $|M| \geq 2$. Then the following condition are equivalent:*
(1) *R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*
(2) *$T_n(R)$ is lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. **(1) ⇒ (2)** : It is easy to see that there exists an isomorphism between rings $T_n(R)[M]$ and $T_n(R[M])$, defined by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n}\begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^i & a_{12}^i & \ldots & a_{1n}^i \\ 0 & a_{22}^i & \ldots & a_{nn}^i \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & a_{nn}^i \end{pmatrix} g_i \mapsto \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{11}^i g_i & \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{12}^i g_i & \ldots & \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{1n}^i g_i \\ 0 & \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{22}^i g_i & \ldots & \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{nn}^i g_i \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_{nn}^i g_i \end{pmatrix}$$

Let $\alpha = A_1g_1 + A_2g_2 + \ldots + A_mg_m$ and $\beta = B_1h_1 + B_2h_2 + \ldots + B_nh_n \in T_n(R)[M]$ such that $\alpha\beta \in N_*(T_n(R))[M]$,

where $A_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^i & a_{12}^i & \ldots & a_{1n}^i \\ 0 & a_{22}^i & \ldots & a_{nn}^i \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & a_{nn}^i \end{pmatrix}$, $B_j = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}^j & b_{12}^j & \ldots & b_{1n}^j \\ 0 & b_{22}^j & \ldots & b_{nn}^i \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \ldots & b_{nn}^j \end{pmatrix} \in T_n(R)$.

We know that $N_*(T_n(R)) = \{m = (m_{ij}) \in T_n(R) | m_{ii} \in N_*(R)\}$. Therefore, from $\alpha\beta \in N_*(T_n(R))[M]$, we get $(\sum_{i=0}^{r} a_{pp}^i g_i)(\sum_{j=0}^{s} b_{pp}^j h_j) \in N_*(R)[M]$, for $p = 1, 2 \ldots n$. Since R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring, therefore, $a_{pp}^i b_{pp}^j \in N_*(R)$, for each p and each i, j. Hence, $A_iB_j \in N_*(T_n(R))$ for each i and j. Thus, $T_n(R)$ is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring.
(2) ⇒ (1) : Since subring of lower nil M-Armendariz ring is lower nil M-Armendariz ring, so R is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. □

Now, below example makes it clear that full matrix ring $M_2(R)$ over a ring R is not a lower nil M-Armendariz ring.

Example 2.1. *Let M be a monoid with $|M| \geq 2$ and R is a ring. Take $e \neq g \in M$. Let $\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} e - \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} g$ and $\beta = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} e + \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} g$. Then $\alpha\beta \in N_*(M_2(R))[M]$. But $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \notin N_*(M_2(R))$. Hence $M_2(R)$ is not a lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*

Proposition 2.2. *Let M be a cancellative monoid and N an ideal of M. If R is lower nil N-Armendariz ring, then R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Suppose that $\alpha = a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n$, $\beta = b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m \in R[M]$ such that $\alpha\beta \in N_*(R)[M]$. Take $k \in N$, then $kg_1, kg_2, \ldots kg_n, h_1k, h_2k, \ldots h_nk \in N$ and $kg_i \neq kg_j$ and $h_ik \neq h_jk$ when $i \neq j$. Now,

$$(\sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i k g_i)(\sum_{j=1}^{m} b_j h_j k) \in N_*(R)[N] \tag{2.4}$$

and we know that R is lower nil N-Armendariz ring, therefore $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$ for each i, j. Thus, R is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. □

Definition 2.1. *Let R be a ring and let $S^{-1}R = \{u^{-1}a \mid u \in S, a \in R\}$ with S a multiplicative closed subset of the ring R consisting of central regular elements. Then $S^{-1}R$ is a ring.*

Proposition 2.3. *Let M be a monoid and S be a multiplicative monoid in a ring R consisting of central regular elements. Then R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring if and only if so is $S^{-1}R$.*

Proof. Suppose that R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring. Let $\alpha\beta \in N_*(S^{-1}R)[M]$ for $\alpha = p_1g_1 + p_2g_2 + \ldots + p_ng_n$ and $\beta = q_1h_1 + q_2h_2 + \ldots + q_mh_m \in (S^{-1}R)[M]$. Here, we take $p_i = a_iu^{-1}$ and $q_j = b_jv^{-1}$, where $a_i, b_j \in R$ for each i, j and $u, v \in S$. From $\alpha\beta \in N_*(S^{-1}R)[M]$, we have $(a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n)(b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m) \in N_*(R)[M]$. Since R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring, therefore, $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$. Since $N_*(S^{-1}(R)) = N_*(R)S^{-1}$, so $p_iq_j = a_iu^{-1}b_jv^{-1} = a_ib_j(uv)^{-1} \in N_*(S^{-1}(R))$. Thus, $S^{-1}R$ is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring.
Converse is obvious because subring of lower nil M-Armendariz ring is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. □

Lemma 2.1. *Let M be a monoid with a nontrivial element of finite order and R be a ring such that $0 \neq 1$. Then R is not a lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Suppose that $e \neq g \in M$ has order n. Take $\alpha = 1e + 1g + \ldots + 1g^{n-1}$ and $\beta = 1e + (-1)g$. Then $\alpha\beta = 0$ i.e. $\alpha\beta \in N_*(R)[M]$ but $1 \notin N_*(R)$. Hence R is not a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let M be a monoid and N, a submonoid of M. If R is lower nil M-Armendariz ring, then R is a lower nil N-Armendariz ring.*

Definition 2.2. *If $T(G)$ contain elements of finite order in an abelian group G. Then $T(G)$ is a fully invariant subgroup of G. Group G is said to be torsion-free group if $T(G) = \{e\}$.*

Theorem 2.3. *Let G be a finitely generated abelian group. Then the following condition on G are equivalent:*
(1) *G is torsion-free.*
(2) *There exist a ring R with $|R| \geq 2$ such that R is a lower nil G-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. **(1) ⇒ (2):** If G is finitely generated abelian group with $T(G) = e$. Then $G \cong \mathbb{Z}\times\mathbb{Z}\times\ldots\times\mathbb{Z}$. By [[5], lemma 1.13], G is u.p.-monoid. If we take R is semicommutative ring with $|R| \geq 2$, then by Theorem (2.1), R is lower nil G-Armendariz ring.
(2) ⇒ (1): Let $g \in T(G)$ and $g \neq e$. Then $N =< g >$ is a cyclic group of finite order. If a ring $R \neq 0$ is lower nil G-Armendariz ring, then R is lower nil N-Armendariz ring by Lemma (2.2). This contradict Lemma (2.1). Thus, every ring $R \neq 0$ is not a lower nil G-Armendariz ring. Therefore, $g = e$ and $T(G) = e$. □

Definition 2.3 ([6])**.** *Let M be a monoid. A ring R is said to be strongly M-semicommutative ring if whenever $\alpha\beta = 0$ implies $\alpha R[M]\beta = 0$, where $\alpha = a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n$ and $\beta = b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m \in R[M]$.*

Lemma 2.3. *Let M be a monoid and N a u.p.-monoid. If R is semicommutative ring as well as M-Armendariz ring, then R is strongly M-semicommutative ring. Hence $R[M]$ is lower nil N-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Let $\alpha = a_1g_1 + a_2g_2 + \ldots + a_ng_n$ and $\beta = b_1h_1 + b_2h_2 + \ldots + b_mh_m \in R[M]$ such that $\alpha\beta = 0$. This implies $a_ib_j = 0$ for each i and j, since R is M-Armendariz ring. Also R is semicommutative, therefore $a_iRb_j = 0$ for each i, j. Again, we can easily see that $\alpha R[M]\beta = 0$. So by Theorem (2.1), we have $R[M]$ is a lower nil N-Armendariz ring. □

Proposition 2.4. *Let M and N be u.p.-monoids. If R is semicommutative ring and M-Armendariz ring, then $R[N]$ is lower nil M-Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Since M and N both are u.p.-monoid, threfore $N_*(R)[M] = N_*(R[M])$ and $N_*(R)[N] = N_*(R[N])$, by [[4], Theorem 3]. Next, from Lemma (2.3), $R[M]$ is a lower nil N-Armendariz ring. Also, rings $R[N][M]$ and $R[M][N]$ are isomorphic under the following map

$$\sum_p \Big(\sum_i a_{ip}n_i\Big)m_p \longmapsto \sum_i \Big(\sum_p a_{ip}m_p\Big)n_i.$$

Now, let

$$\Big(\sum_i \alpha_i g_i\Big)\Big(\sum_j \beta_j h_j\Big) \in N_*(R[N])[M],$$

where $\alpha_i, \beta_j \in R[N]$ and $g_i, h_j \in M$. We claim that $\alpha_i\beta_j \in N_*(R[N])$ for each i and j. Assume that

$$\alpha_i = \sum_p a_{ip}n_p,\ \ \beta_j = \sum_q b_{jq}n_q^{'} \in R[N].$$

Then

$$\Big(\sum_i \Big(\sum_p a_{ip}n_p\Big)g_i\Big)\Big(\sum_j \Big(\sum_q b_{jq}n_q^{'}\Big)h_j\Big) \in N_*(R[N])[M] = N_*(R)[N][M].$$

Thus, we have

$$\Big(\sum_p \Big(\sum_i a_{ip}g_i\Big)n_p\Big)\Big(\sum_q \Big(\sum_j b_{jq}h_j\Big)n_q^{'}\Big) \in N_*(R)[M][N] = N_*(R[M])[N].$$

By Lemma (2.3), $R[M]$ is a lower nil N-Armendariz ring, so

$$\Big(\sum_i a_{ip}g_i\Big)\Big(\sum_j b_{jq}h_j\Big) \in N_*(R[M]) = N_*(R)[M]$$

for all p, q. Hence, $a_{ip}b_{jq} \in N_*(R)$ for each i, j, p, q and since R is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. So

$$\alpha_i\beta_j = \Big(\sum_p a_{ip}n_i\Big)\Big(\sum_q b_{jq}n_j^{'}\Big) \in N_*(R)[N] = N_*(R[N])$$

for each i, j. Thus, $R[N]$ is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let M, N be u.p.-monoid and R a semicommutative ring. If R is M-Armendariz ring, then R is a lower nil-$M \times N$ Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Construction of this proof is based on the proof of Theorem [2.3] of [5]. Let $\sum_{i=1}^{t} a_i(m_i, n_i) \in R[M \times N]$. Without loss of generality, we assume that $\{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_t\} = \{n_1, n_2, \ldots, n_s\}$ with $n_i \neq n_j$, where $1 \leq i \neq j \leq s$.

$$Let \qquad A_p = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq t, n_i = n_p\}, for\ 1 \leq p \leq s.$$

Then

$$\sum_{i=1}^{s}\Big(\sum_{i\in A_p} a_i m_i\Big)n_p \in R[M][N].$$

Note that $m_i \neq m_{i'}$ for any $i, i^{'} \in A_p$, when $i \neq i^{'}$. It is easy to see that there exist an isomorphism between rings $R[M \times N]$ and $R[M][N]$ defined by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{t} a_i(m_i, n_i) \mapsto \sum_{p=1}^{s}\Big(\sum_{i\in A_p} a_i m_i\Big)n_p.$$

Assume that

$$\Big(\sum_{i=1}^{t} a_i(m_i, n_i)\Big)\Big(\sum_{j=1}^{t^{'}} b_j(m_j^{'}, n_j^{'})\Big) \in N_*(R[M \times N]).$$

Then from the above isomorphism, it follows that

$$\Big(\sum_{p=1}^{s}\Big(\sum_{i\in A_p} a_i m_i\Big)n_p\Big)\Big(\sum_{q=1}^{s^{'}}\Big(\sum_{j\in B_q} b_j m_j^{'}\Big)n_q^{'}\Big) \in N_*(R[M][N]).$$

By Lemma (2.3), $R[M]$ is a lower nil N-Armendariz ring. Therefore,

$$\Big(\sum_{i\in A_p} a_i m_i\Big)\Big(\sum_{j\in B_q} b_j m_j^{'}\Big) \in N_*(R[M]) = N_*(R)[M].$$

Also by Theorem(2.1), R is a lower nil M-Armendariz ring. Therefore, $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$ for each $i \in A_p$ and $j \in B_q$. Moreover, $a_ib_j \in N_*(R)$ for each i and j, where $1 \leq i \leq t$ and $1 \leq j \leq t^{'}$. Hence R is a lower nil $M \times N$-Armendariz ring.

□

References

[1] A. Alhevaz, E. Hashemi and M. Ziembowski, Nilradicals of unique product monoid rings, J. Algebra Appl. 16(5) (2016), 1750133-18.

[2] E. P. Armendariz, A note on extensions of Baer and P.P.-rings, J. Austral. Math.Soc. 18 (1974), 470-473.

[3] G. F. Birkenmeier, H. E. Heatherly and E. K. Lee, Completely prime ideals and associated radicals, in: S. K. Jain, S. T. Rizvi (Eds.), Proc. Biennial Ohio StateDenison Conference (1992), World Scientific, New Jersey (1993), 102-129.

[4] J. S. Cheon and J. A. Kim, Prime radicals in u.p.-monoid rings, Bull. Korean. Math. Soc. 49(3) (2012), 511-515.

[5] Z. K. Liu, Armendariz rings relative to a monoid, Comm. Algebra 33(3) (2005), 649-661.

[6] M. J. Nikmehr, Strongly Semicommutative Rings Relative to a Monoid, Ukrainian Math. J. 66(11) (2014), 1715-1730.

[7] J. Okninski, Semigroup Algebras, Monographs and Textbooks in Pure and Applied Mathematics, Vol. 138 (Marcel Dekker, New York, (1991).

[8] D. S. Passman, The Algebraic Structure of Group Rings (Wiley, New York, 1977).

[9] L. Motais de Narbonne, Anneaux semi-commutatifs et unisriels anneaux dont les idaux principaux sont idempotents, in: Proceedings of the 106th National Congress of Learned Societies, Perpignan, 1981, Bib. Nat., Paris, (1982), 71-73.

[10] M. B. Rege and S. Chhawchharia, Armendariz rings, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. 73 (1997), 14-17.